



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/529,999

03/31/2005

Eiji Kasutani

P/1927-11

5396

2352 7590 07/21/2009  
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN  
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

ANDRAMUNO, FRANKLIN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2424

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/21/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/529,999	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KASUTANI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FRANKLIN S. ANDRAMUNO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2424	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/28/09.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14, 16-20, and 22-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14, 16-20 and 22-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/25/09</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-52 have been considered but are moot in view of new ground of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2, 14, 16-17, 20, 22-23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Netravali, and Kotani.

Regarding claims 1-2, 14, 20, Hershtik discloses a video viewing system for viewing a desired video comprising **(movie version 1 in figure 1)** a first video group recorded on a first memory device **(local memory (500) in figure 4)**, the first video group having a plurality of first group videos, each of the first group videos having a plurality of sections **(movie versions 1-5 in figure 1)**, and a second video group

Art Unit: 2424

recorded on a second memory device (**New Movie segment: record first frame (560) in figure 4**), the second video group having a plurality of second group videos (**accumulate length of current movie segment (570) in figure 4**), each of the second group videos including selected sections of at least two first group videos such that at least one section of each of the first group videos is included in the second video group (**column 2 lines 45-49**). A third video group recorded on a third memory device, the third video group having a plurality of third group videos (**column 3 lines 16-25**), each of said third group videos including selected videos from said second group videos of the second video group such that at least one video of the second group videos is included in the third video group and such that at least some of said selected sections of the first group videos are included in the third video group (**column 3 lines 29-35**).

**However, Hershtik fails to teach a** processor operable to determine a correlation between a predetermined video of one of the first group and the second group and videos of the other of the first group and the second group. Netravali teaches on (**column 1 lines 51-59**) the closest reference pattern for each region of the video image is determined by aligning each region against the reference patterns. The present invention selects a group of reference images using feature attribute matching. Netravali also teaches each video of said first video group includes a correlation information stored on the first memory device in association with said each video of said first video group (**column 2 lines 31-36**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a correlation engine. This is a useful combination because the system will be able to compare and rank the relationship between a group of video clips.

**However, Hershtik and Netravali fail to teach** a frequency-of-use of said sections of the first group videos in said second video group. Kotani teaches on **(column 3 lines 19-21)** means for storing the signal including the video signal having a high using frequency.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a frequency-of-use for a specific video. This is a useful inventive step because it acquires the frequency a specific program was displayed within a specified time.

Regarding claims 16, 22, Netravali discloses the video viewing method according to claim 14, wherein said used selected sections are identified based on correlation **(column 1 lines 51-59)** information including at least the frequency-of-use of each section of each first group video in said second video group **(column 3 lines 19-21 Kotani)**.

Regarding claims 17, 23, Kotani discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4, wherein said control unit graphs and displays the frequency-of-use **(column 3 lines 41-45)** of said specified section in said second or third video group **(column 3 lines 29-35 Hershtik)**.

1. Claims 18-19 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1) in view of Maybury et al (US 6,961,954 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Netravali, Kotani and Maybury.

Regarding claims 18, 24, Hershtik discloses the video viewing system according to claim 6 **(figure 1)**. **However, Hershtik, Netravali and Kotani fail to teach** wherein said control unit displays a pointer movable in a time axis direction of said specified section together with said graphed frequency-of-use of said specified video. Maybury teaches on **(figures 3 and 4)** the graph of the frequency of video with respect to time **(It should be point out that Kotani teaches on column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency)**. And displays said specified section from a time position indicated by said pointer when said pointer is operated **(figure 14)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine Maybury and Kotani, to include the use of graphing the videos with high using frequency. This is a useful combination because identifying the most watched videos helps target and distribute videos geographically.

Regarding claims 19, 25, Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 3, wherein said control unit sorts and displays said frequency-of-use in any one of ascending order and descending order **((column 17 lines 4-8) Maybury teaches the**

Art Unit: 2424

**result of a query can be sorted in descending order of temporal occurrence. In addition, Kotani teaches column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency. As a result, combining Maybury and Kotani, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the sorting of a descending and ascending order).**

2. Claims 3, 9, 13, 30, 36, and 40,, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Netravali, and Kotani.

Regarding claims 3, 9, 13, 30, 36, and 40, Hershtik discloses a video viewing system for viewing **(movie version 1 in figure 1)** a desired video from videos of a first video group **(movie versions 1-5 in figure 1)**, a second video produced by editing said first video group **(column 2 lines 45-49)**, and a third video produced by editing said second video, the video viewing system **(column 3 lines 29-35)** comprising: A first storage unit which stores as to enable retrieval of said first video group **(column 2 lines 26-29)**, said second video group, and said third video group **(column 2 lines 34-39)**, such that selected sections of at least two videos of the first video group are included in the second video group and at least one section of the second video group and at least some of the selected sections of the first video group are included in the third video group such that the videos of the first **(column 2 lines 50-61)**. Generating a plurality of video groups such that selected sections of at least two videos of one video group are

included in videos of a next video group (**column 5 lines 1-5**), and storing the generated plurality of video groups together on a memory device (**column 3 lines 41-43**).

**However, Hershtik fails to teach the** second and third video groups have a series of correlations showing that each section of the third video group correlates to at least one section of said second video group and at least one section of said first video group. Netravali teaches on (**column 1 lines 51-59**) the closest reference pattern for each region of the video image is determined by aligning each region against the reference patterns. The present invention selects a group of reference images using feature attribute matching. In addition, Netravali teaches generating a correlation information such that the correlation information includes each section of each first group video in said second or third video group and storing as to enable retrieval of the correlation information (**column 2 lines 51-55**), the correlation information being stored on a respective memory device in association with each video of any one video group (**column 2 lines 31-36**). A second storage unit which stores as to enable retrieval of mutual correlations obtained from said series of correlations (**column 6 lines 62-66**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a correlation engine. This is a useful combination because the system will be able to compare and rank the relationship between a group of video clips.

**However, Hershtik and Netravali fail to teach** a frequency-of-use of said sections of the first group videos in said second video group. Kotani teaches on (**column 3 lines 19-21**) means for storing the signal including the video signal having a



Art Unit: 2424

high using frequency. Kotani also teaches a control unit which displays said frequency-of-use on a display unit (**column 3 lines 21-24**). Furthermore, Kotani discloses the plurality of video groups having a hierarchy and a series of correlations reflecting that selected sections of one video group are edited to produce a video of the next video group in the hierarchy (**column 13 lines 18-24**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a frequency-of-use for a specific video. This is a useful inventive step because it acquires the frequency a specific program was displayed within a specified time.

2. Claims 5-8, 10-12, 31-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1) in view of Maybury et al (US 6,961,954 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Netravali, Kotani and Maybury.

Regarding claims 5, Kotani discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4, wherein said frequency-of-use generation unit comprises (**column 3 lines 19-21**): a retrieval unit which, upon specification of a video of any one video group of said first video group and second video group (**column 2 lines 45-49 Hershtik**), to identify a used video section of said specified video in said second or third video group produced by use of said specified video (**column 2 lines 26-29 Hershtik**); and a frequency-of-use calculation unit which generates the frequency-of-use of said specified video in said

Art Unit: 2424

second or third video group produced by use of said specified video based on said used video section **(column 3 lines 21-24)**.

**However Hershtik, Netravali, and Kotani fail to teach** retrieving correlation information on said specified video from said second storage unit. Maybury discloses on **(figure 1)** a correlation engine.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a correlation engine. This is a useful combination because the system is capable of matching the similarities between two video groups.

Regarding claims 6, 11 Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4, wherein said control unit graphs and displays the frequency-of-use **(figures 3 and 4)** of said specified section in said second or third video group **(It should be point out that Kotani teaches on column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the combine Kotani and Maybury to include the use of a graph of the frequency of use)**.

Regarding claims 7, 12, 34 and 39 Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 6, wherein said control unit displays a pointer movable in a time axis direction of said specified section together with said graphed frequency-of-use of said specified video **(figures 3 and 4)**, and displays said specified section from a time position indicated by said pointer when said pointer is operated **(It should be point out**

**that Kotani teaches on column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the combine Kotani and Maybury to include the use of a graph of the frequency of use).**

Regarding claims 8, 35, Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 3, wherein said control unit sorts and displays said frequency-of-use in any one of ascending order and descending order **((column 17 lines 4-8) Maybury teaches the result of a query can be sorted in descending order of temporal occurrence. In addition, Kotani teaches column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency. As a result, combining Maybury and Kotani, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the sorting of a descending and ascending order).**

Regarding claims 10 and 37, Maybury discloses the video viewing method according to claim 9, wherein in said step d), generating said frequency-of-use **(Figure 9)** by identifying a used frame number of said specified video from said used video section **(Frames in figure 8)**, and counting said used frame number in all used video sections in said second or third video group produced by use of said specified video **(Frequency in figure 4)**.

Regarding claim 31, Maybury discloses the video system according to claim 30, wherein said second storage unit stores as to enable retrieval of correlation **(correlation in figure 1)** information showing that each video section correlates to one

Art Unit: 2424

video section of other video groups for each of said plurality of video groups (**column 6 lines 62-66**).

Regarding claim 32, Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4, wherein said frequency-of-use generation unit comprises (**Tag frequencies of the last 7 days in figure 8**): a retrieval unit which, upon specification of a video of any one video group of said first video group and second video group (**figure 6**), retrieves correlation information on said specified video from said second storage unit (**Correlation (120) in figure 1**) to identify a used video section of said specified video in said second or third video group produced by use of said specified video (**figure 13**); and a frequency-of-use calculation unit which generates the frequency-of-use of said specified video in said second or third video group produced by use of said specified video based on said used video section (**tags in figure 19**).

Regarding claim 33, 38, Kotani discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4, wherein said control unit graphs and displays the frequency-of-use (**column 3 lines 19-21**) of said specified section in said second or third video group (**column 2 lines 45-49 Hershtik**).

1. Claims 26-29 and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Netravali, and Kotani.

Regarding claims 26-29 and 47, Hershtik discloses a video viewing system for viewing a desired video comprising **(movie version 1 in figure 1)** a first video group recorded on a first memory device **(local memory (500) in figure 4)**, the first video group having a plurality of first group videos, each of the first group videos having a plurality of sections **(movie versions 1-5 in figure 1)**, and a second video group recorded on a second memory device **(New Movie segment: record first frame (560) in figure 4)**, the second video group having a plurality of second group videos **(accumulate length of current movie segment (570) in figure 4)**, each of the second group videos including selected sections of at least two first group videos such that at least one section of each of the first group videos is included in the second video group **(column 2 lines 45-49)**. A third video group recorded on a third memory device, the third video group having a plurality of third group videos **(column 3 lines 16-25)** produced by editing said second group videos of the second video group such that each third group videos includes at least one of the selected sections of the first group videos **(column 3 lines 29-35)**. Wherein at least one video selected from said first group videos and said second group videos is specified,

**However, Hershtik fails to teach the** a processor operable to determine a correlation between a predetermined video of one of the first group and the second group and videos of the other of the first group and the second group. Netravali teaches on **(column 1 lines 51-59)** the closest reference pattern for each region of the video image is determined by aligning each region against the reference patterns. The present invention selects a group of reference images using feature attribute matching.

Art Unit: 2424

In addition, Netravali teaches said correlation being based on said sections of the first group videos in said second video group **(column 2 lines 51-55)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a correlation engine. This is a useful combination because the system will be able to compare and rank the relationship between a group of video clips.

**However, Hershtik and Netravali fail to teach** a frequency-of-use of said sections of the first group videos in said second video group. Kotani teaches on **(column 3 lines 19-21)** means for storing the signal including the video signal having a high using frequency. Kotani also teaches a control unit which displays said frequency-of-use on a display unit **(column 3 lines 21-24)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a frequency-of-use for a specific video. This is a useful inventive step because it acquires the frequency a specific program was displayed within a specified time.

Regarding claim 48, Kotani discloses the video viewing method according to claim 41, wherein the frequency-of-use of said at least one video in said other video groups **(column 3 lines 19-21)** is calculated based on a used video section in other video groups of said specified video **(column 2 lines 51-55 Netravali)**.

Regarding claim 49, Netravali discloses the video viewing method according to claim 42, wherein said used video section is identified based on correlation information **(column 2 lines 51-55)** showing that each video section correlates to one video section

Art Unit: 2424

of other video groups for each of a plurality of video groups (**column 1 lines 51-59**) having a series of correlations that at least one video of one video group is used to produce a video of the next video group (**column 2 lines 51-55**).

2. Claims 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1) in view of Maybury et al (US 6,961,954 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Netravali, Kotani and Maybury.

Regarding claims 50-51, Hershtik discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4 (**figure 1**). **However, Hershtik, Netravali, and Kotani fail to teach** wherein said control unit graphs and displays the frequency-of-use of said specified section in said second or third video group. Maybury teaches on (**figures 3 and 4**) the graph of the frequency of video with respect to time (**It should be point out that Kotani teaches on column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency**). And displays said specified section from a time position indicated by said pointer when said pointer is operated (**figure 14**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine Maybury and Kotani, to include the use of graphing the videos with high using frequency. This is a useful combination because identifying the most watched videos helps target and distribute videos geographically.

Regarding claim 52, Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 3, wherein said control unit sorts and displays said frequency-of-use in any one of ascending order and descending order **((column 17 lines 4-8) Maybury teaches the result of a query can be sorted in descending order of temporal occurrence. In addition, Kotani teaches column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency. As a result, combining Maybury and Kotani, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the sorting of a descending and ascending order).**

3. Claims 41-42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Kotani.

Regarding claim 41, Hershtik discloses a video viewing method for viewing a desired video from a plurality of videos **(column 3 lines 17-21)**, group videos of one video group being produced by editing videos of previous video group **(column 1 lines 31-42)** such that selected sections of at least two videos of the previous video group are included in videos of the one video group, and storing said previous video group **(column 2 lines 40-44)**,



**However, Hershtik fails to teach** said one video group and said hierarchy on a memory device of a general purpose computer; and for at least one video of one of the video groups. the method comprising: providing a hierarchy of video groups, each video group of said hierarchy having a plurality of group videos. Kotani discloses on **(column 13 lines 18-24)** the operator may previously rank a news value to recording materials, and it may be transferred to the near line server (43) after a passed time corresponding to this rank. Assigning a rank to the system demonstrates the use of a hierarchy memory device. In addition **(column 13 lines 41-45)** the data to be distributed is video and/or audio data, however, character data or various data ca be considere other than that and also there are applicable to a news program producing and broadcasting system. Lastly Kotani teaches calculating frequency-of-use of the at least one video in other video groups and displaying said calculated frequency-of-use on a display device **(column 3 lines 19-21)**.

Regarding claim 42, Kotani discloses the video viewing method according to claim 41, wherein the frequency-of-use of said at least one video in said other video groups **(column 3 lines 19-21)** is calculated based on a used video section in other video groups of said specified video **(column 3 lines 17-21 Hershkit)**.

4. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Kotani, and Netravali.

Regarding claim 43 , Hershkit discloses the video viewing method according to claim 42 **(figure 1)**. **However, Hershkit, and Kotani, fail to teach** wherein said used video section is identified based on correlation information. . Netravali teaches on **(column 1 lines 51-59)** the closest reference pattern for each region of the video image is determined by aligning each region against the reference patterns. The present invention selects a group of reference images using feature attribute matching. In addition, Netravali teaches showing that each video section correlates to one video section of other video groups for each of a plurality of video groups **(column 2 lines 31-36)** having a series of correlations that at least one video of one video group is used to produce a video of the next video group **(column 6 lines 62-66)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the use of a correlation engine. This is a useful combination because the system will be able to compare and rank the relationship between a group of video clips.

5. Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hershtik et al (US 5,790,236) in view of Kotani et al (US 6,347,180 B1) in view of Netravali et al (US 4,611,347) in view of Maybury et al (US 6,961,954 B1). Hereinafter referred as Hershtik, Kotani, Netravali, and Maybury.

Regarding claims 44-45, Hershtik discloses the video viewing system according to claim 4 **(figure 1)**, **However, Hershtik, Netravali, and Kotani fail to teach** wherein said control unit graphs and displays the frequency-of-use of said specified section in

Art Unit: 2424

said second or third video group. Maybury teaches on **(figures 3 and 4)** the graph of the frequency of video with respect to time **(It should be point out that Kotani teaches on column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency)**. And displays said specified section from a time position indicated by said pointer when said pointer is operated **(figure 14)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine Maybury and Kotani, to include the use of graphing the videos with high using frequency. This is a useful combination because identifying the most watched videos helps target and distribute videos geographically.

Regarding claim 46, Maybury discloses the video viewing system according to claim 3, wherein said control unit sorts and displays said frequency-of-use in any one of ascending order and descending order **((column 17 lines 4-8) Maybury teaches the result of a query can be sorted in descending order of temporal occurrence. In addition, Kotani teaches column 3 lines 19-21 means for storing the signal including the video signal having high using frequency. As a result, combining Maybury and Kotani, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include the sorting of a descending and ascending order)**.

***Conclusion***

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKLIN S. ANDRAMUNO whose telephone number is (571)270-3004. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:30am - 5:00pm) alternate Fri off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571)272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2424

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Kelley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2424